

Remarks

Claims 1-28 and 30 are pending in the instant application. Claim 29 has been canceled. Claim 1 has been amended to include the limitation of canceled claim 29. Therefore, no new matter has been added. The Applicants expressly reserve the right to further prosecute the same or similar claims in subsequent patent applications claiming the benefit of priority to the instant application. 35 USC § 120.

Rejections Under 35 USC § 103(a)

Multiple sets of claims stand rejected under 35 USC § 103(a), based on the Examiner's contentions that they are rendered obvious by various patents or publications or combinations thereof. Notwithstanding the fact that the Applicants believe they are or will be able to provide facts and arguments sufficient to overcome all of them, the Applicants are sincerely grateful for the Examiner's detailed analysis and explanation of the propounded obviousness rejections. However, in the interests of more rapidly securing patent rights in the United States for a portion of their patentable invention, the Applicants have elected to pursue in the instant application claims to the subject matter that the Examiner has indicated is allowable over all prior art of record.

Specifically, the Applicants have amended claim 1 to include the limitation of claim 29, which claim was indicated to be allowable in the Final Office Action because "the prior art does not disclose a reaction vessel containing at least one insoluble resin bead comprised of an octenediol functionalized resin." Due to the amendment of claim 1, claim 29 has been canceled. Because claim 1 and all of the pending dependent claims now comprise a claim limitation that the Examiner deemed sufficient to confer allowability, the Applicants respectfully contend that claims 1-28 and 30 are likewise allowable.

Therefore, the instant Amendment and Response does not address any of the propounded obviousness rejections. Nevertheless, as noted above, should the Applicants choose to prosecute the same or similar claims in a continuing application (e.g., CON or DIV) claiming the benefit of priority to the instant application and its predecessors, they

believe they will be able to provide facts and arguments sufficient to prosecute such claims to allowance.

Accordingly, the Applicants respectfully request the withdrawal of the rejection of all pending claims under 35 USC § 103(a).

Fees

The Applicants believe they have provided for the required fees in connection with the filing of this paper. Nevertheless, the Director is hereby authorized to charge any additional required fee to our Deposit Account, **06-1448**.

Conclusion

In view of the above remarks, it is believed that the pending claims are in condition for allowance. Therefore, the Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the pending rejections. If a telephone conversation with Applicants' Attorney would expedite prosecution of the above-identified application, the Examiner is urged to contact the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,
Foley Hoag LLP

By: 

Dana M. Gordon, PhD
Reg. No. 44,719
Attorney for Applicants

155 Seaport Boulevard
Boston, MA 02210

Telephone: (617) 832-1000
Telecopier: (617) 832-7000

Date: 1/20/06